Sl. No.	State	2000-01	2001-02
20.	Mizoram	—	101.00
21.	Himachal Pradesh	75.00	75.00
22.	Sikkim	—	30.00

Implementation of Pre-Natal Diagnostic Technique Act, 2000

2938. SHRIMATI SAROJ DUBEY: Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a number of States have not implemented the provisions of Pre-Natal Diagnostic Technique (Regulation and Prevention of Misuse) Act, 2000;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) whether the Supreme Court in its recent judgement has ordered registration of ultrasound machine users throughout the country and confiscation of unlicensed clinics; and

(d) if so, whether any directions have been issued by his Ministry in this regard alongwith monitoring of the Act?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI A. RAJA): (a) and (b) The Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques (Regulation and Prevention of Misuse) Act, 1994 is enacted and enforced in all States and UTs except Jammu and Kashmir where the Act is not in force.

(c) The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has passed an order on 4.5.2001 directing, *inter alia*, registration of all bodies using ultrasound machines under the Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques (Regulation and Prevention of Misuse) Act, 1994. Further in its Order dated 29th January, 2002, the Hon'ble Court has directed to seal and seize the ultrasound machines/scanners using by unregistered organizations.

(d) All the States and Union Territories been advised to ensure strict compliance of the Orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court both in the implementation and the enforcement of the Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques (Regulation and Prevention of Misuse) Act, 1994, to seize and seal the ultrasound machines/scanners of those

organisations which have not got themselves registered under the said Act and to launch prosecutions against those who are found violating the provisions of the Act by detecting/disclosing the sex of the foetus of a pregnant woman. States/UTs have reported that they are taking appropriate action in this respect.

Withdrawal of CGHS facilities to KVS pensioners

2939. SHRIMATI SAROJ DUBEY: Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that CGHS facilities extended to eligible pensioners of Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangthan at par with other CGHS beneficiaries have been withdrawn recently; and

(b) if so, the reasons for the withdrawal of the scheme for KVS pensioners?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI A. RAJA): (a) and (b) The Government had extended CGHS facilities only to the serving employees and not to the retired employees of the Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan in Delhi, Bangalore, Hyderabad/Secunderabad, Mumbai, Chennai and Kolkata.

However, some of the CGHS units, in different parts of the country had inadvertently issued CGHS cards to the retired employees of Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan. When this discrepancy was brought to the notice of the Government, instructions were issued to all the CGHS Units in the country to rectify the mistake by withdrawing the CGHS cards, which were inadvertently issued to the retired employees of Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan.

Anti Cancer Drug Fulgrastim

2940. SHRI MUNNAVAR HASAN:
MISS MABEL REBELLO:

Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Nicholas Piramal received favours from DCGI's office for their Anti-Cancer Drug Fulgrastim;